



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE  
P.O. BOX 1450  
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

Paper No.

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER  
LLP  
901 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW  
WASHINGTON DC 20001-4413

**COPY MAILED**

SEP 16 2009

**OFFICE OF PETITIONS**

In re Patent No. 7,534,253	:	
Endara et al.	:	DECISION ON
Issue Date: May 19, 2009	:	REQUEST FOR
Application No. 10/731,153	:	RECONSIDERATION OF
Filed: December 10, 2003	:	PATENT TERM ADJUSTMENT
Attorney Docket No. 06530.0313	:	

This is a decision on the "REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION OF PATENT TERM ADJUSTMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.705(d)," filed June 22, 2009, requesting that the patent term adjustment determination for the above-identified patent be changed from seven hundred fifty-eight (758) days to one thousand and twelve (1012) days.

The request for reconsideration of patent term adjustment is **DISMISSED**.

On May 19, 2009, the above-identified application matured into US Patent No. 7,534,253 with a patent term adjustment of 758 days. This request for reconsideration of patent term adjustment was timely filed within two months of the issue date of the patent. See 37 C.F.R. § 1.705(d).

The Office acknowledges submission of the \$200.00 fee set forth in 37 C.F.R. § 1.18(e). No additional fees are required.

Patentees assert entitlement to a patent term adjustment of 1012 days (368 + 782 + 1 reduced by 114 overlap - 25 (applicant delay)).

The Office agrees that an RCE was filed 3 years and 368 days after the filing date of this application. The Office agrees that certain actions were not taken within the specified time frames, and thus, the entry of a period of adjustment of 782 days for Office delay is correct. At issue is whether Patentees

should accrue 254 days of patent term adjustment for the Office taking in excess of three years to issue the patent (368 days less the 114 days of overlap), as well as 782 days for Office failure to take certain actions within a specified time frame (or examination delay).

The Office contends that the entire 368-day period overlaps. Patentees' calculation of the period of overlap is inconsistent with the Office's interpretation of this provision. 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(2)(A) limits the adjustment of patent term, as follows:

to the extent that the periods of delay attributable to grounds specified in paragraph (1) overlap, the period of any adjustment granted under this subsection shall not exceed the actual number of days the issuance of the patent was delayed.

Likewise, 37 CFR 1.703(f) provides that:

To the extent that periods of delay attributable to the grounds specified in §1.702 overlap, the period of adjustment granted under this section shall not exceed the actual number of days the issuance of the patent was delayed.

As explained in *Explanation of 37 CFR 1.703(f) and of the United States Patent and Trademark Office Interpretation of 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(2)(A)*, 69 Fed. Reg. 34283 (June 21, 2004), the Office interprets 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(2)(A) as permitting either patent term adjustment under 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(1)(A)(i)-(iv), or patent term adjustment under 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(1)(B), but not as permitting patent term adjustment under both 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(1)(A)(i)-(iv) and 154(b)(1)(B). Accordingly, the Office implements the overlap provision as follows:

If an application is entitled to an adjustment under 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(1)(B), the entire period during which the application was pending (except for periods excluded under 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(1)(B)(i)-(iii)), and not just the period beginning three years after the actual filing date of the application, is the period of delay under 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(1)(B) in determining whether periods of delay overlap under 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(2)(A). Thus, any days of delay for Office issuance of the patent more than 3 years after the filing date of the application, which overlap

with the days of patent term adjustment accorded prior to the issuance of the patent will not result in any additional patent term adjustment. See 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(1)(B), 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(2)(A), and 37 CFR § 1.703(f). See *Changes to Implement Patent Term Adjustment Under Twenty Year Term; Final Rule*, 65 Fed. Reg. 56366 (Sept. 18, 2000). See also *Revision of Patent Term Extension and Patent Term Adjustment Provisions; Final Rule*, 69 Fed. Reg. 21704 (April 22, 2004), 1282 Off. Gaz. Pat. Office 100 (May 18, 2004). See also *Explanation of 37 CFR 1.703(f) and of the United States Patent and Trademark Office Interpretation of 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(2)(A)*, 69 Fed. Reg. 34283 (June 21, 2004).

As such, the period for over 3 year pendency does not overlap only to the extent that the actual dates in the period beginning three years after the date on which the application was filed overlap with the actual dates in the periods for failure of the Office to take action within specified time frames. In other words, consideration of the overlap does not begin three years after the filing date of the application.

In this instance, the relevant period under 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(1)(B) in determining whether periods of delay "overlap" under 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(2)(A) is the entire period during which the application was pending before the Office, December 10, 2003 to December 13, 2007 (the date on which the RCE was filed). 782 days of patent term adjustment were accorded prior to the filing of the RCE for the Office failing to respond within specified time frames during the pendency of the application. All of the 368 days for Office delay in issuing the patent overlap with the 782 days of Office delay (1 day was accorded subsequent to the filing of the RCE).

The 368 days attributed to the delay in the issuance of the patent overlaps with the adjustment of 782 days attributable to the grounds specified in 37 C.F.R. § 1.702(a)(1). Accordingly, at issuance, the Office properly entered no additional days of patent term adjustment for the Office taking in excess of 3 years to issue the patent.

In view thereof, no adjustment to the patent term will be made.

Telephone inquiries specific to this matter should be directed to Paul Shanoski, Senior Attorney, at (571) 272-3225.

*Christina P. Donnell for*

Anthony Knight  
Supervisor  
Office of Petitions